

REBUTTAL OF OBJECTIONS TO DESIGNATION OF *ATTUS AUDAX*
HENTZ, 1845, AS TYPE SPECIES OF *PHIDIPPUS* KOCH, 1846

(ARANEAE). Z.N.(S.) 1904

(see *Bull.* vol. 27: 103, 213)

- (1) By G.B. Edwards (*Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Affairs, Bureau of Entomology, Gainesville, Florida 32602, U.S.A.*)

In *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 27: 213 J.A. Beatty and R. Leech objected to a petition by H.W. Levi & L. Pinter (*ibid.*: 103) to suppress *Salticus variegatus* Lucas, 1833 and to set aside its fixation as the type species of *Phidippus* Koch, 1846 in favour of *Attus audax* Hentz, 1845. I would like to give a point by point rebuttal of Beatty's objections (Leech's objection is the same as Beatty's objection C); each rebuttal is coded by the same letter as the objection to which it refers.

A. The objection is trivial. While *Phidippus audax* (Hentz) may not be the most common jumping spider in absolute numbers, it certainly is one of the most common on and about human dwellings, and without doubt ranks either first or second in absolute numbers among species of the genus *Phidippus* (based on museum collections).

B. Even though the petition by Levi & Pinter indicates that ecologists and textbook writers have been the primary users of the name *Phidippus audax*, this name has also been used in taxonomic works and checklists for the species in question much more often than has the name *P. variegatus* (which has been used usually for the species now known as *P. regius* C.L. Koch, as previously indicated by Levi & Pinter).

C. Since no type is available for either *Salticus variegatus* or *Attus audax*, the most logical procedure would be to choose the most stable name, rather than dig up a third name to add to the confusion. This is what Levi & Pinter have done: they chose to use the most stable name, *Phidippus audax*.

D. While at the time of writing (1971) this objection may have had some validity, it has no validity at present. There are more active taxonomists working primarily on the SALTICIDAE in the United States (six) than are working primarily on any other family of spiders in that country. Generic and even subfamilial relationships have become much more clear due to collaboration by these specialists. There is no disagreement as to the limits of the genus *Phidippus*. Most importantly, the name *Phidippus audax* (Hentz) has been the only name used for the species in question since the original petition in 1970, including its use in several internationally distributed handbooks to spiders by the noted spider authorities B.J. Kaston and H.W. Levi.

It is now time for the reconsideration recommended by Beatty; I am presently revising the genus *Phidippus* and I am fully in support of the merits of nomenclatural stability provided by the Levi & Pinter petition.

- (2) By Bruce Cutler (*1747 Eustis Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55113, USA*)

In 1970 I wrote to the Commission to support the petition by Levi & Pinter to conserve *Attus audax* Hentz, and I continue to support it. Dr

Edwards has adequately rebutted the objections by Beatty & Leech. An additional factor is the paper by Taylor, B.B. & Peck, W.B., *J. Arachnol.*, vol. 2: 89–99, 1975, which reports successful interbreeding between northern and southern forms of that species. In addition to the confusion with *Phidippus regius* C.L. Koch mentioned by Edwards, and by Levi & Pinter in their original petition, the southern forms had been considered as belonging to *P. variegatus*, while northern specimens were considered as *P. audax*. The interbreeding demonstrates that one biological species is involved. The overwhelming preponderance of usage favours the name *Phidippus audax* (Hentz) for this taxon.

COMMENTS ON REQUEST FOR A DECLARATION MODIFYING
ARTICLE 1 SO AS TO EXCLUDE NAMES PROPOSED FOR DOMESTIC
ANIMALS FROM ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE. Z.N.(S.) 1935

(see vol. 27: 269–272; vol. 28: 77–78, 140; vol. 29: 108;
vol. 34: 137–140)

(1) By Richard G. Van Gelder (*American Museum of Natural History,
Central Park West at 79th St, New York, N.Y. 10024, USA*)

Groves (1971, 1977) has suggested that the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature be modified to exclude names proposed for domestic animals from zoological nomenclature. Should the Commission choose to modify the Code as he suggests, far more disruption to zoological nomenclature will occur than currently exists. I do not find the present situation as deplorable as does Groves.

Groves' main premise seems to be that domestic animals are not subspecies because they have evolved 'artificially' rather than 'in nature', that they do not have discrete geographic distribution comparable to 'wild' subspecies, and that their existence as discrete entities is dependant upon human protection. He concludes that if a specific epithet is based upon a domestic animal, then a trinomen for a wild subspecies cannot nor should not be included under the specific name that originated from a domestic animal.

Equus caballus Linnaeus is the commonly accepted name for the domestic horse, and *Equus caballus caballus* is the trinomial generally accepted and used for all breeds of domestic horses. Groves would find unacceptable the use of *Equus caballus przewalskii* for the wild Mongolian horse, a commonly-accepted trinomial that indicates conspecificity between the wild and domestic forms. He presumably would prefer to remove *E. caballus* from zoological nomenclature, and thereby indicate the wild horse of Mongolia as *Equus ferus przewalskii*. (*Equus ferus ferus* Boddaert, 1785, the tarpan, would be the nominate race and one of the races from which *E.*